

REMARKS

1. Claims 56-75 are rejected as being indefinite.

These claims have been amended for clarification purposes to overcome the rejection.

It should be noted that the change from media/finishing to media and/or finishing was to clarify the attributes could be either media or finishing, or both media and finishing.

2. Claims 56, 59, 62, 65, 68, 70 and 71 are rejected as being obvious over Livingston in view of Keyworth because it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Keyworth of displaying a plurality of thumbnails in Livingston's system since it would allow users quickly to review and to change each individual page's attributes.

To make a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show (i) some suggestion or motivation to combine the references, (ii) a reasonable expectation of success, and (iii) that the prior art references teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

To this end, it is necessary to present evidence that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine the relevant teachings of the applied references in the proposed manner to arrive at the claimed invention. In the present case, the only suggestion for the proposed combination improperly stems from applicant's disclosure and not from the isolated teachings of Livingston and Keyworth. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modification. Here, hindsight is relied upon to arrive at the determination of obviousness. It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Hindsight reconstruction cannot be used to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. In this case, the required suggestions supporting the modification and combination are missing from Livingston and Keyworth.

While applicant's take issue with the proposed combination, even if a person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine the teachings of Livingston and Keyworth as suggested, the claimed features still

would not be met. Specifically, Keyworth discloses displaying images representative of persons and their associated titles. Combining Keyworth with Livingston would not provide displaying page representations for each of the pages of a document wherein media and/or finishing attributes for each page are displayed on a GUI by selecting the page representation.

3. Claims 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, and 67 are rejected as being obvious over Livingston, in view of Keyworth, and further in view of Habib because it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to add popup feature to the button palette in modified Livingston's system since it would conserve the display space and that it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Habib of a page setup include a pull down menu and a dialog box in modified Livingston's system since it would make it easier for users to control the attributes via the pull down menu and dialog box.

Applicant's respectfully submit that Claims 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, and 67 are not obvious over Livingston, Keyworth and Habib for the reasons provided above.

In addition, the required suggestions supporting the proposed modification and combination are missing from Livingston, Keyworth and Habib.


4. Claims 72-75 are rejected as being obvious over Livingston in view of Keyworth, and further in view of Connors, because it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Connors of detecting conflicts between media/finishing attributes and media/finishing attributes which are improperly set in modified Livingston's system since it would allow the system to avoid the inadvertently setting conflicts.

Applicant's respectfully submit that Claims 72-75 are not obvious over Livingston, Keyworth and Connors for the reasons provided above.

In addition, the required suggestions supporting the proposed modification and combination are missing from Livingston, Keyworth and Connors.

It is believed that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,766

Richard A. Romanchik/d-n
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-726-7522
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.